

healthy ocean carrier industry to facilitate fair and open maritime commerce among our trading partners will become the oversight priority.

Mr. President, as FMC Commissioner Ming Hsu recently told a large gathering of shippers and industry representatives, "This has been not only a long journey, but a long needed journey * * * With the passage of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act and the FMC's new regulations, I believe the maritime industry will be far less shackled by burdensome and needless regulations * * * I believe we can now look forward to an environment which gives you the freedom and flexibility to develop innovative solutions to your ever-changing ocean transportation needs." I couldn't agree more.

The FMC regulatory process bore some resemblance to the legislative process that preceded it. A few early steps started to head off in the wrong direction, but through honest dialogue among the industry and the government parties, the course was corrected and the intent of the 1998 Act was embodied in the regulations. Now the FMC faces the challenge of implementing the new regulations in a manner consistent with Congressional intent.

Mr. President, through the 1998 Act, the Congress directed the FMC to spend less effort attempting to regulate the day-to-day business of ocean carriers and spend more effort on countering truly market distorting activities. This shift is made possible by giving exporters and importers greater opportunity and ability to use the marketplace to satisfy their ocean shipping requirements through less government intervention.

Recent efforts by some countries to protect their domestic maritime industries by imposing restrictive trade practices indicates that this shift in emphasis is well-timed. I am particularly concerned about China's efforts to impose greater regulatory control over the ocean shipping industry as the rest of the world is heading in the opposite direction. While the Maritime Administration seem to be nearing an agreement eliminating unfair practices by Brazil, continued vigilance is required. As we are seeing with Japan's port practices, the problem can remain long after such an agreement is reached.

Mr. President, I should point out that paradigm shifts are often painful, but enlightening, for involved organizations. To its credit, the FMC met the challenge of promulgating the new regulations by the March 1, 1999 deadline. Now, I recognize that Congress issues many deadlines for the Executive Branch, sometimes with little success. But I want to personally congratulate the FMC for its tremendous effort and responsiveness to complete these regulations on time. Not only did the FMC

deliver its rules on time; the FMC's rules are clearly within the intent of Congress. I feel good about that.

I want to express my gratitude to the four FMC Commissioners, Chairman Hal Creel, Ming Hsu, John Moran, and Delmond Won, for their leadership and wisdom during this process. This band of four challenged the staff to think "outside the box" of the previous regulatory system and develop innovative methods to monitor the industry in a less intrusive manner. Also, I want to recognize the efforts of the FMC staff members who worked long and hard to meet Congress' deadline: George Bowers, Florence Carr, Jennifer Devine, Rachel Dickon-Matney, Bruce Dombrowski, Rebecca Fenneman, Vern Hill, Christopher Hughey, Amy Larson, David Miles, Tom Panebianco, Austin Schmitt, Matthew Thomas, Bryant VanBrakle, Ed Walsh, and Ted Zook. Their hard work and sweat will truly benefit this Nation by enabling industry and its customers to prepare for this new era of ocean shipping.

Mr. President, just as it took several years for the legislative process to bear fruit, I urge patience before evaluating the results of this rulemaking. I will continue to monitor the transition process for this fundamental change. The Ocean Shipping Reform Act can't fix international economic imbalances and uncertainties, but it will give the industry and its customers much-needed flexibility to work through many difficult situations.

Mr. President, The health of our Nation's economy depends on a healthy system for international trade, and therefore, a dependable ocean shipping industry. The FMC rules will provide the necessary certainty in a manner consistent with Congressional intent. Again, I salute the FMC for being responsive.

GRASSLEY-WYDEN INITIATIVE LETTER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter sent to all Senators today addressing the procedures governing the use of holds, signed by the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, and myself, be placed in the RECORD. This letter is a result of ongoing negotiations between Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN, the Democratic leader and myself, beginning early in the 105th Congress, and encourages all Members to make their legislative holds known.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 25, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As the 106th Congress begins, we wish to clarify to all colleagues, procedures governing the use of holds during the new legislative session. All Senators should remember the Grassley and Wyden initiative, calling for a Senator to "provide notice

to leadership of his or her intention to object to proceeding to a motion or matter [and] disclose the hold in the Congressional Record."

While we believe that all Members will agree this practice of "secret holds" has been a Senatorial courtesy extended by party Leaders for many Congresses, it is our intention to address some concerns raised regarding this practice.

Therefore, at the beginning of the first session of the 106th Congress, all Members wishing to place a hold on any legislation or executive calendar business shall notify the sponsor of the legislation and the committee of jurisdiction of their concerns. Further, written notification should be provided to the respective Leader stating their intentions regarding the bill or nomination. Holds placed on items by a Member of a personal or committee staff will not be honored unless accompanied by a written notification from the objecting Senator by the end of the following business day.

We look forward to working with you to produce a successful new Congress.

Best regards,

TRENT LOTT,

Majority Leader.

TOM DASCHLE,

Democratic Leader.

DEPARTURE OF SANDRA STUART AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, last week the Defense Department and the Congress lost the services of an outstanding public servant when Sandi Stuart stepped down as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

For the last six years, beginning in 1993, Sandi Stuart has served as the senior legislative advisor to three Secretaries of Defense—our former colleague the late Les Aspin; Dr. Bill Perry; and the current Secretary of Defense Bill Cohen. During this time she has earned a well-deserved reputation as a skilled legislative strategist and an effective spokesperson for the Secretary of Defense and for the interests of the men and women in uniform and their families.

At the same time, because of her extensive experience over almost 15 years in senior staff positions in the House of Representatives, Sandi had tremendous credibility on Capitol Hill as someone who understood how Congress worked. She knew that to be successful working with Congress—particularly in the area of national security policy—requires an ability to work closely with members and staff on both sides of the aisle. She did that very well, and leaves the Defense Department with the respect and gratitude of Democratic and Republican members and staff alike.

Mr. President, I have worked closely with Sandi Stuart for the past six years on a broad range of national security policy issues. She has done an outstanding job of meeting the needs of the Armed Services Committee, and I

have come to rely heavily on her advice and counsel.

Mr. President, Sandi Stuart has also become a good friend, and we will miss her. I want to take this opportunity to thank her for her service to the country, and to wish her continued success in the private sector as she leaves the Department of Defense.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, March 2, 1999, the federal debt stood at \$5,649,288,631,596.74 (Five trillion, six hundred forty-nine billion, two hundred eighty-eight million, six hundred thirty-one thousand, five hundred ninety-six dollars and seventy-four cents).

One year ago, March 2, 1998, the federal debt stood at \$5,514,791,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred fourteen billion, seven hundred ninety-one million).

Five years ago, March 2, 1994, the federal debt stood at \$4,554,852,000,000 (Four trillion, five hundred fifty-four billion, eight hundred fifty-two million).

Ten years ago, March 2, 1989, the federal debt stood at \$2,743,744,000,000 (Two trillion, seven hundred forty-three billion, seven hundred forty-four million).

Fifteen years ago, March 2, 1984, the federal debt stood at \$1,468,923,000,000 (One trillion, four hundred sixty-eight billion, nine hundred twenty-three million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,180,365,631,596.74 (Four trillion, one hundred eighty billion, three hundred sixty-five million, six hundred thirty-one thousand, five hundred ninety-six dollars and seventy-four cents) during the past 15 years.

IMPROVING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

Mr. ABRAHAM. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article on "Improving Human Rights in China" written by Jim Dorn, vice president for academic affairs at the Cato Institute. Dorn advocates that Congress return to legislation "designed to change China's stand on human rights and to liberate the Chinese people from religious and political persecution." This call is particularly timely given the most recent wave of repression against those inside China who seek to widen freedom and political discourse in that country. Higher taxes in the form of higher tariffs is not the answer, as Dorn points out. However, that does not mean America and the U.S. Congress, and, indeed, the President, should not be strongly advocating the rule of law and respect for political dissent in China. I recommend Jim Dorn's piece to my colleagues and encourage continued vigilance in the defense of civil liberties and freedom

for the Chinese people. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Feb. 8, 1999]

IMPROVING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CHINA

(By James A. Dorn)

The use or threat of trade sanctions to advance human rights in China has done relatively little to change policy in Beijing. Congress should consider alternative measures to improve human rights in China.

Trade sanctions are a blunt instrument; they often fail to achieve their objectives and end up harming the very people they are intended to help.

In the case of China, placing prohibitively high tariffs on Chinese products entering the United States in order to protest Beijing's dismal human rights record would cost U.S. consumers billions of dollars.

It would also slow the growth of China's nonstate sector, which has allowed millions of Chinese to move to more productive jobs outside the reach of the Communist Party. Isolating China would reverse the progress that has been made since economic reform began in 1978 and would create political and social instability.

A better approach is to continue to open China to the outside world and, at the same time, use non-trade sanctions and diplomacy to advance human rights. When China violates trade agreements or intellectual property rights, however, it should be held accountable, and carefully targeted trade sanctions may be warranted.

The piracy of intellectual property is a serious problem for Western firms. China has been a major offender of copyright laws and needs to comply with the rule of law. China's membership in the World Trade Organization should be conditioned on Beijing's adherence to international law.

The problem is that most less-developed countries, and even some developed countries, violate intellectual property rights. Using economic sanctions to punish pirates sounds good in theory, but in practice sanctions are seldom effective.

The real solution to piracy may have to wait for technological changes that make it very costly to steal intellectual property. And it may have to wait for the rule of law to evolve in China and other less-developed countries.

As China develops its own intellectual property, there will be a demand for new laws to protect property rights. The uncertainty created by China's failure to protect these rights can only harm China in the long run. Investors will not enter a market if they cannot reap most of the benefits of their investments.

Fan Gang, an economist at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, predicts that things will change in China as people discover that clearly defined and enforced property rights are to their advantage.

People, he said, "are bound to find that all this cheating and protecting yourself from being cheated consume too much time and energy, and that the best way to do business is playing by a set of mutually respected rules. New rules and laws will be passed, and people will be ready to abide by them."

The United States has considerable leverage in dealing with China and should not let it dictate U.S. foreign policy or allow human rights to be a nonissue.

The United States is China's largest export market, and U.S. investors rank third in

terms of foreign direct investment in China. Clearly China would be harmed by any significant cutback in trade with an investment from the United States.

The problem is that any sizable cutback would also harm the United States and the world economy.

To avoid the high costs (and low probable benefits) that stem from the use of trade sanctions, Congress should consider using non-trade sanctions such as cutting off the flow of taxpayer-financed aid to China—including aid from the International Monetary Funds, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

Another possible non-trade sanction is making public the names of companies known to be using prison labor or companies run by the People's Liberation Army so that U.S. consumers can boycott their products.

The China Sanctions and Human Rights Advancement Act, S. 810, introduced in the 105th Congress by Sen. Spencer Abraham, R-Mich., lists those and other measures designed to move China toward a free society.

The 106th Congress should return to that and other legislation designed to change China's stand on human rights and to liberate the China people from religious and political prosecution.

(The passage of H.R. 2647, one of four "Freedom of China" bills enacted by the 105th Congress as part of the 1999 Defense Authorization Act, is a step in the right direction. That bill requires publication of the names of PLA-run companies operating in the United States.)

Congress should recognize that advancing economic freedom in China has had positive effects on the growth of China's civil society and on personal freedom.

According to Chinese dissident Wang Dan, "Economic change does influence political change. China's economic development will be good for the West as well as for the Chinese people."

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:17 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 221. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to permit certain youth to perform certain work with wood products.

H.R. 514. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes.

H.R. 609. An act to amend the Export Apple and Pear Act to limit the applicability of the Act to apples.

H.R. 669. An act to amend the Peace Corps Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 to carry out that Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 818. An act to amend the Small Business Act to authorize a pilot program for the implementation of disaster mitigation measures by small businesses.

H.R. 882. An act to nullify any reservation of funds during fiscal year 1999 for guaranteed loans under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for qualified beginning farmers or ranchers, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President